

REMARKS

Claims 1-53, 55-90 and 92-110 are now pending in the application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the personal interview conducted on August 9, 2006. During the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed a proposed amendment to the claims clarifying that the baseline correction current is analog. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment appeared to overcome the Sallaway reference. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 12, 24, 37, 48, 61, 74, 85 and 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dankberg (U.S. Pat. No. 5,596,439) in view of Sallaway et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,980,644). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, as best understood by Applicant, the alleged combination fails to show, teach, or suggest a first sub-circuit having a third input which receives an analog baseline correction current, and a second sub-circuit for controlling the analog baseline correction current. Instead, the combination appears to disclose digital baseline correction.

It is a longstanding rule that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1974), see MPEP §2143.03. Furthermore, when evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, all of the limitations must be considered and given weight. *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App.

1983), MPEP § 2144.03. Here, Sallaway, either singly or in combination with Dankberg, fails to disclose the limitation of a third input which receives an analog baseline correction current, and a second sub-circuit for controlling the analog baseline correction current.

As shown in an exemplary embodiment of the present invention in FIG. 4, a baseline correction module 4 outputs a baseline correction current in the analog domain. Applicant respectfully notes that the FIG. 4 indicates that the baseline correction module 4, as well as a transmit canceller 3, are located in an analog portion of the circuit. Further, as shown in an exemplary embodiment in FIG. 11, the transmit canceller 3 receives a plurality of currents, including a baseline correction current 6. Applicant respectfully notes that current is inherently in the analog domain.

As best understood by Applicant, Sallaway fails to disclose a third input which receives an analog baseline correction current, and a second sub-circuit for controlling the analog baseline correction current, and instead discloses a digital baseline wander correction method. For example, the Examiner relies on column 11, line 62 through column 12, line 15 of Sallaway to disclose this limitation. The cited portions of Sallaway state (referring to FIG. 113):

At this point, the signal is a fully equalized receive signal. The signal then needs to be scaled and have the baseline wander (BLW) removed. Digital automatic gain control (AGC) 154 then boosts the signal to the levels expected by slicer 158 and the forward error correction (FEC) circuit (not shown). Digital automatic gain control (AGC) 154 receives control signals from AGC adapter 155. Baseline wander (BLW) correction circuit 156 removes the base line wander from the signal. Baseline wander (BLW) correction circuit 156 receives control signals from baseline wander (BLW) adapter 157. (Emphasis added).

Further, as shown in FIG. 1 B, the baseline wander correction circuit 156 receives a signal directly from the digital AGC 154. Initially, a digital equalizer 151 receives the signal from an analog to digital converter (ADC). In other words, Sallaway appears to disclose digital baseline wander correction.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons. The remaining independent claims, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least similar reasons.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 18, 2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

By: 
Damian M. Aquino
Reg. No. 54,964